

pmw

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.951 OF 2018
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L.) NO.15 OF 2017

Shri Prakash Poddar	... Applicant
<u>In the matter between</u>	
Shri Prakash Poddar	... Appellant
Vs.	
The Commissioner of Central Excise, Thane – I	... Respondent

Ms. Deepali Kamble for the Applicant/Appellant.
Mr. M. Dwivedi for the Respondent.

CORAM : A.S.OKA AND
M.S. SANKLECHA, JJ.

DATE : 27th MARCH 2019.

P.C. :

1 Heard the learned counsel appearing for the applicant/appellant and the learned counsel appearing for the respondent. In view of the averments made in the affidavit-in-support, a case for restoration is made out of the appeal which was rejected under the orders of the Prothonotary and Senior Master in exercise of powers under Rule 986 of the Bombay High Court (Original Side) Rules. Accordingly, notice of motion is made absolute in terms of prayer clauses (a) and (b). We make it clear that if within the extended time, all office objections are not removed, the order of rejection will stand.

(M.S. SANKLECHA, J.)

(A.S.OKA, J.)